



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OUR PROBLEM, AND A PLATFORM¹

BY THOMAS D. GOODELL
Yale University

Our presence here is evidence that we think we have a problem before us. We are gathered in the hope that we may assist each other in solving it. Our students in classics—at least in Greek—are getting fewer, not in all places absolutely, yet on the whole, at least relatively. But what troubles us is not any private aspect of this. Personally we are all fairly successful in our profession, as the world goes—reasonably certain to find places where we can continue to earn a modest living. What disturbs us is the public aspect of the matter. We think this trend away from Greek is not good—that it indicates a serious evil in education, and is of bad omen for the future. And there is also a personal side that troubles us, in that we, by our professional position, are more or less responsible. At least we ask ourselves: Are we or are we not responsible? Isn't there something we can do about it? If there is something we can do to check the trend away from Greek, and we fail to do it, we shall be responsible; and we should like to clear our consciences. Many people, we are aware, think the trend we deplore is not of evil omen, but of good. It is what they have been trying to bring about; they think they have benefited education thereby, and that the next generation will be better off in consequence. But we are so infatuated with those old classics that we no longer stop to argue that with such people. Putting aside all the old questions of requirement, of classics versus science, or of ancient languages versus modern, we hold that the study of Latin is good for the great majority of boys and girls who take a high-school course or its equivalent; and that the study of Greek would be good for many who do not take it. In short, we hold that the present trend away from Greek is a public misfortune; we think we should be doing a public service if we could do something

¹ Read before the New England Classical Association, Springfield, Mass., April 6, 1906.

on the other side. Can we, or not? And what ought we to do? That is our problem.

Now, since I am a teacher of Greek, and since Latin is better intrenched than Greek, in facts that still appeal to all serious students of education, you will find it natural, I think, if I confine myself mainly to the question of Greek. The study of Greece and Rome and their influence in the world is in many aspects inseparably one. And the same influences that now oppose Greek studies are unfavorable to Latin studies also. Yet we all recognize that the crisis in Greek studies is more imminent. In the long run we must stand or fall together; and just now the Latinist can do most for the common cause, which is simply the advancement of sound education, by helping, as he may have opportunity, the cause of Hellenism.

The first step toward determining whether we can do anything, and what we should do, is to get the facts before us and look them squarely in the face. What are the significant facts in regard to Greek study in school and college in this country today? They are by no means all discouraging; but we had better look at the unpleasant ones first.

In simple terms, the number of students of Greek in colleges and secondary schools has at best barely kept pace with the increase in population, while the total increase in the number of pupils in these institutions has vastly outrun the increase in population. This means a large relative decrease in the students of Greek. In our eastern states the ratio of Greek students to population has fallen. Then, while fifty years, forty years, even thirty years ago the number of girls studying Greek was insignificant, now they are a considerable fraction of the total. This has an encouraging side, of course; but it means that the proportion of boys taking Greek is so much smaller. Farther, in our colleges less time is allowed for Greek to those who take it at all. From five hours a week to three hours a week, as at Yale, is a common reduction. In relatively few institutions, as at the universities of Chicago, California, and Princeton, is Greek still required for an A.B. degree. There have been two stages, roughly speaking, in this trend away from Greek. First came the fierce fight against the intrenchment of Greek in the cur-

riculum as an absolute requirement for the degree. Victory in this fight, at one institution after another, is naturally followed by the stage of indifference as to whether students take Greek or not. Why should anybody take Greek if he doesn't like it, when a college says officially that it doesn't care, and doesn't think anyone less well educated without Greek than with it?

From about 1860 for some twenty-five years, and even later to some extent, the chief armory from which the assailants of Greek drew their missiles was the first chapter of Herbert Spencer's little book on *Education*. This was a shallow, youthful work of an able but narrow man—wonderfully persuasive, however, to ill-trained thinkers. Spencer was making a special plea for the recognition of natural science in British education. To that end he framed his whole theory of education; and he knew little and cared little about poetry or art, and nothing about any philosophy but his own. How could a sound theory of education be framed by such a man?

Among our countrymen the honor of leading in this assault belongs to two Harvard men, Charles Francis Adams and President Eliot. It is now nearly twenty-three years since Mr. Adams delivered his address on "A College Fetich" before the Harvard chapter of Φ B K.¹ This was a really powerful statement of the case against required Greek, the culmination of previous agitation and the beginning of a new campaign. Though logically destructive of much of Spencer's chapter, in effect this address supplemented it, and has furnished all the familiar arguments that the older armory did not contain. Spencer wanted all literature got out of the way for science; Mr. Adams wanted Greek got out of the way for modern languages. His friend, Mr. Eliot, had begun in 1869 his long and distinguished administration of the presidency of Harvard. There was thirty-five years ago no real university on this side of the Atlantic. The graduate courses at Yale were a beginning of one, but a very modest beginning. Americans who desired a university training, non-professional, had to go to Europe, and

¹ It is but just, in printing now what was said last April about the position of Mr. Adams, to call attention to his Phi Beta Kappa address of last June at Columbia University. In this—an utterance no less notable on many accounts than that of 1883—Mr. Adams makes it clear that experience and observation have greatly modified some of his views, and that he now appreciates better the worth of Greek studies.

most of them went to Germany. It was natural at that time for the young president of Harvard to look to the German educational system as the model on which our own should be reformed. The American college has no analogue in Germany or France. President Eliot worked in the belief that our college accordingly should disappear, in the secondary school below and the university above. Thus we should arrive at an organization parallel to that of Germany and France; the secondary school would rise to the level of *Gymnasium* or *lycée*, while out of the upper years of the college should be developed the university proper. As steps toward that result the entrance requirements should be raised, the college course shortened, and the required curriculum broken up by introducing at once the freedom of choice of courses, the German *Lernfreiheit*, with large extension of the lecture method of instruction. All these changes introduced by President Eliot were consistent parts of one plan, which even twenty years ago might well seem to many a wise one; to all who so believed, President Eliot was a far-sighted leader in educational advance. At present the wisdom and far-sightedness are not so clear. More now recognize that in our old college we had in American form an institution of great value, lost on the European continent, retained still and of great value in England—an institution that had proved its worth to America, needing only to be better adapted to changing conditions. However, President Eliot carried Harvard with him; and the part of his plan that now concerns us is the introduction of wide options in college and for entrance—his version of the German *Lernfreiheit*. Now, the *Lernfreiheit* of the German student is rigidly limited by the state examination, through which alone the German can gain access to the careers to which the university leads. The German youth is free to choose the place, the order, and the teacher, in the specified group of studies; but he has almost no freedom, after selecting his career, to choose the subjects of study. But all this was overlooked. No subject, except English, was to be required in Harvard. Another influence upon President Eliot should be mentioned, with delicacy and respect, but plainly, because this is an important chapter in our educational history. Whoever reads Mr. Eliot's interesting biography of his son must see at once that the distaste of this youth for Greek strongly reinforced the father's

tendency to underestimate the importance of other literatures than our own in education, and the force of Hellenism in history. The detailed account of his son's education is made a continuous plea for removal of all restraint upon the free indulgence of a boy's individual taste in the selection of studies.

We are all aware how by one extension after another almost entire freedom in choice of college studies has been established at Harvard, and the example has been followed more or less fully in most American colleges. Not all, be it noted. Princeton is doing good service by working along another line. A rational group system has held its own at Johns Hopkins, and I believe will be re-established eventually at other colleges. But that will still leave Greek no longer required in most colleges for the A.B. degree. If at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and many others of the better colleges no Greek is required for the A.B. degree, then we may say broadly that American colleges no longer especially favor, to any extent worth mentioning, the study of Greek. Mathematics, modern languages, and a modicum of Latin still, are required—are in the position of “protected” studies that seemed so dreadful as held by Greek; Greek alone has been thrown completely out of that position. The resulting decrease in the number of Greek students is naturally largest at Harvard, where under President Eliot's influence larger premiums than elsewhere have been offered for leaving Greek.

But the arguments of Herbert Spencer and Mr. Adams and President Eliot would have had little effect, were it not that they merely led and gave public utterance to a widespread and powerful public opinion that had long been gathering head. Public opinion—like the private opinion of which it is made up—is rarely influenced by formal argument, except as that organizes and formulates views already settled and merely awaiting formulation. It is this public opinion, now against us, well satisfied with its victory, that we have to deal with.

Two broad facts there are which alone go far to account for this attitude of our opponents. And these facts are solid and permanent. We cannot change them, and one we do not desire to change. These are, first, the vast increase of new knowledge. The value to mankind, and the interest to healthy minds, of the modern sciences

and modern literatures are beyond dispute. A liberal education must include some introduction to this great intellectual world, so marvelous, so pregnant with incalculable promise, and so relatively new. A readjustment of education that should recognize this was plainly called for; and whatever our predecessors did, no sensible man of fifty or younger has ever opposed that in principle. Such readjustment was difficult, and is still difficult. Many considerations are involved, when you take this up practically in detail, where certain types of mind see but one or two. But that is too large a question for this occasion; I merely note that such readjustment was necessary; we make no quarrel with the advance of the race. Secondly, there has been the world over an increase in force, and a wider extension, of the desire for material success as against things of the mind. This too has its good side. In growing larger and more complex, business has gained more of an intellectual character, has become more like the professions, attractive to vigorous minds. And the wider diffusion of material well-being is a real advance of the race; though not the one thing needful, it is a thing useful as a basis for many good things. Anyone may properly desire a good income. But that desire brings dangers with it. It is perilously easy for it to get the upper hand; many in all ages, more now than hitherto, have allowed it to weaken the desire for what is better. The desire for a good income never, under present conditions, leads to the study of Greek; it leads directly away from Greek. All these influences then, arising from the growth of new knowledge, and from the desire for wealth, are permanent forces against Greek, tending steadily to drive the study farther into the background.

But there is a third influence. In re-reading the other day Mr. Adams' address—for years I kept my copy handy and read it many times; it is good reading for us classical teachers—two aspects of it stood out clearly, as they did twenty years ago. On the one side a reckless exaggeration, a charming series of unfounded assumptions, of inconsistencies, of non-sequitur's, a resolute ignoring of all evidence inconvenient for his argument, the fine audacity of a highly successful man laying the blame for his lack of success exclusively on his teachers. Granted. But on the other side the

substantial truth of his main points. In so far as his argument dwelt on the growth of modern science, on the value of modern literatures, on the absorbing interest of the great currents of throbbing life in the present world, we all go with him—barring exaggerations—heartily. But he dwelt also on things less agreeable—on the “limp superficiality” of classical teaching; the contemptibly low standard of attainment that satisfied the requirements; the waste of time, due to wretched teaching, in attaining even that standard; the small number who ever learned Greek so as to read easier authors well enough to be led to read them for their own sake. Was he right in this, or was he wrong? Right, clearly. There has been improvement since his day, now five decades ago; improvement had begun—barely begun—in my day in the early seventies; it has been going on a little more rapidly since Mr. Adams spoke. But in the main, I appeal to you, is not his indictment still, in substance, true? Here for the first time in our survey we reach an element over which we here gathered have some control. Is it not along this line, and this line solely, that we classical teachers must work? The undoubted fact that few students at the end of the sophomore year have a real appreciation of the classics, or can read Greek or Latin readily enough to read a new page with pleasure, puts the capstone on the wall of deterrence built up by the other considerations. Unless something can be done here, the cause is lost.

This brings us to the question: Why, then, should anyone study Greek? What are we teaching it for? Have we ourselves any clear conception of our aim? Most disheartening it is to see the disagreement and the confusion of thought on this point among the advocates of Greek. Their arguments rarely appear to me to hit the mark; they would rarely influence me, were I an honest doubter; they often damage the cause.

For one thing, harm and harm alone is done by loose talk about the mental discipline of Greek study. That never convinces anybody, while it puts into the opponent's hand a ready weapon both for defense and for offense. He will assure you that as good mental discipline may be had from the real mastery of a modern language; and you can't prove him wrong. Or he reminds you that the mental

discipline of linguistic training is provided for in Latin, and you don't need Greek added for that. He is right. Or he may say: Very well, then, why not take Sanskrit or Chinese, which are still more different from our native tongue, and so more difficult, and therefore will furnish still more discipline? Or he reminds you that, as things now are, both French and German must be acquired as mere tools, for scientific or literary work of every kind; if Greek and Latin must be added, you have a serious disproportion between the various kinds of mental discipline. The language side of the growing mind is overtrained at the expense of other sides equally important. Again you have no answer without shifting your ground. And if you appeal to experience, and say that results, in specific cases or classes of cases, show that the discipline of classical training tells effectually in the later years of study and in practical life, there are familiar ways of throwing doubt on the validity of your examples. Clearly there is something wrong with this argument from mental discipline. If nothing else, it lays emphasis on the wrong element. In fact, those who operate much with the term "mental discipline" or the like are people who have never taken the trouble to analyze it; they have no clear idea of what they mean. They have merely caught up a current formula that rests on a vague analogy between study and bodily training—an analogy barely sufficient to suggest the figure, but so partial as to make the figure gravely mislead. Brain development, not muscular, furnishes the nearest physical parallel to mental development; and you can't build a brain by gymnastics. Of the real nature of education and mental growth those who use that figure seem to have little notion. Yet some of our best-known educators and university presidents are among those who thus darken counsel.

It will lead us a little toward the light if we ask: Why are Latin, Greek, French, German, a better quartette of languages for most Americans than Sanskrit, Chinese, Hungarian, and Portuguese? All would agree that they are. No methods of teaching could make the latter four as effective instruments of general education as the former. Why? The reason cannot be in their relative difficulty, in mere mental gymnastics. It cannot be in the languages themselves—in accident, syntax, vocabulary. Or take Russian. Grant that

it has all the excellencies of Greek as a medium for expressing thought, yet Greek will remain superior as an instrument for training our youth. The reason must be connected somehow with the use the languages have been put to, and with the people who have used them—with the thought, literature, history of the several peoples. It is not learning new sets of vocables, inflections, grammatical rules, alphabets, or ideographs, that yields culture, but learning the thoughts, deeds, institutions of a great people, expressed in their literature. That is why your hotel servant or courier, who speaks four languages fluently within his range, is no more cultured than your American hotel servant who speaks but one. In like manner, the child who in favoring circumstances grows up bilingual or trilingual, though he possesses a great convenience, has not thereby acquired education.

But we have not yet reached the heart of the matter. The literatures of Sanskrit, Chinese, Russian, Hungarian, Portuguese are not much, if at all, inferior, on the whole, to the Latin, intrinsically. Japanese education has been quite properly based on the Chinese language and literature. And this suggests the reason why we find Greek, Latin, French, German better for us. They are so because of the historical relations that unite us to the peoples who have used those tongues—relations that constitute us at once the spiritual children and the spiritual brethren of those peoples, as we are not, in anything like the same degree, of the other five. The great main streams of influence from without that have molded Britain and America have flowed from Greece, Rome, Germany, France. Semitic religion, Christianity, has come to us in solution with those streams, largely made over by them. Our immediate ancestors in Britain, permeated by those influences, have modified and added to them; the conditions of our new continent have been a farther selective and coloring force, but have done little to change the intellectual and spiritual bases. Other nations have contributed, notably Italy and Spain; the Slavic races and the Far East are beginning to affect the total appreciably; yet the main foreign currents are still these four.

Now, to get clearly before us the full bearing of this fact, we must go a little deeper and ask: What is the purpose of all education? What is education? A large question, and a formidable. Still,

without some rational answer to that question, one can only flounder about, when considering any educational problem, in a sea of uncertainties and confusion. Every problem of detail leads directly to that as a central question, a right answer to which is prerequisite to clear thought.

Like every complex social institution, education may be looked at from various points of view, and may therefore be described, and truly described, in various ways. The various descriptions, if true, will not conflict. Here is a description adapted from Huxley by a lawyer of my acquaintance, who took seriously his duties as a school official and a father: "To educate is to instruct the intellect in the laws of nature, including men and their ways as well as things and their forces, and to fashion the affections and the will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with those laws." I know no better statement of the spirit that should animate the teacher's daily work and guide parents in their oversight of their children. But we can draw from it no definite answer to questions of detail about courses of study. For that purpose we must consider education from another side, and concretely, as an organized activity of the adult community, exerted on the young. We assume also, as a prerequisite, such material conditions and such physical training as will develop the healthy body; we seek a secure foundation for theory and practice in the proper development of the inner man, the mind and soul. I think this may be readily found by the comparative and historical method—by taking a broad view of human history, in all stages of the growth of our race. Among all tribes and in all ages the essence of education, as an activity of adults exerted on the young, has been, and is, the endeavor to inculcate in them the civilization of the community. Each parent wishes his children to become like the men or women who are most admired; the tribe desires the coming generation to reproduce the present, repeating its successes, avoiding its misfortunes and failures. This common purpose is the inner vital principle that has shaped each educational system to its particular form and character. Every community—Korea no less than Germany or America—regards its own type of civilization as superior to all others. The aim is to train up the young in that, to help them to assimilate and

grow up into the accumulated store of ideas, customs, institutions of the tribe, that the new members may duly take their place in the tribal life, and become competent to carry on its activities. That is the real meaning of our own current popular phrases. To fit young people for life, to enable them to rise in the world, to arm them for success in the struggle for existence, to train the mind and character, to make good citizens—all these partial statements of the aim of education are included under the broader formula. The aim of our education, then, is to introduce the young to our civilization; that is, to help them to assimilate and grow up into the accumulated store of ideas, customs, institutions, that make our community human, civilized, American, so that each young man and woman may find a place in it for life, and for appropriate, useful, and happy work.

Now, this civilization in which our youth are to find a place is a very complex thing, the slow growth of ages. From the cave-man to the Greek what millenniums of development and acquisition! Yet how simple was Greek life, compared with our own. Correspondingly simple was Greek education, compared with our own. The Athenian boy needed no study of foreign languages, because so little that was vital in his civilization had come from foreign or ancient sources. Germs, indeed, and slight remnants from the mostly forgotten Mycenaean age; but out of these germs and remnants the Hellenic race had developed a civilization essentially homegrown, more new and original than any other we know, and more pregnant with vital force for fertilizing later ages and races. Far otherwise with us. The great material advances of the last hundred years make, after all, but a small part of our life. The growth of new knowledge is great, it is true, and contains much that makes the present, and will make all the future, different from the past. But, granting this, it still remains true that most of our civilization has come from the past—even as regards much that we rate highest, from the far-distant past—and resides in immaterial goods—in ideas, and institutions that embody ideas, as law, art, religion. *Those studies that go farthest in explaining our civilization by showing how it has come to be what it is, and those that most effectively familiarize the student with the conceptions that lie at the basis of it and are most dynamic*

in it—these are the studies most important for a liberal education. The question should not be put in the form: What studies are essential? No single college subject is essential, in the sense that no one can be called liberally educated without having studied that subject in college. Whatever subject you name, after the most elementary ones, people can be found who are in fact liberally educated without having been taught that subject. They have pursued other subjects, and have conducted their lives, in a spirit so broad and liberal that the defect has been more or less made good. The question is rather: What studies are most desirable, because they are richest in final results and lead most surely to the goal?

When now the question is so put, with this conception of education and of a liberal education in mind, and some adequate notion of the complexity and of the origins of our American civilization, a rational answer is at hand. Some studies can at once and with certainty be named as among the most desirable studies for whoever would lead, or would be the intellectual companion of those who lead the intellectual life of their generation. For example, mathematics, at least through plane geometry. All nature and all sciences of nature and all arts have as part of their foundations those relations of number and space that are the subject-matter of elementary mathematics. One is not adequately introduced to his environment in modern society without some knowledge of these principles, which are the alphabet of a large portion of modern thought. The question whether one likes mathematics or not, though it greatly affects the method of teaching, has nothing to do with the question whether a youth should or should not study them. Mental discipline is an incident, a by-product—or at most is a single aspect of the process of study. The peculiar training of geometry consists in becoming more at home in dealing, in generalized form, with those relations of space that belong to the immutable foundations of so much of nature, science, and art. Familiarity with such procedure enables one to comprehend more readily the special concrete cases. The alphabet once learned, one can go on and read. You see, the analogy to gymnastic training vanishes. The mind grows by assimilating knowledge worth having, not by going through difficult motions.

So we return to our quartette of languages. French is worth

learning, apart from any direct application to business or social intercourse, because only through the French language and literature can one become at home in French life and the French mind—gain a living sense of the French influence in history and free access to French thought of today. So German. So, too, of Latin, of Greek. For if no really new force can now come from the ancient world, the old forces have worked far longer, have worked far more widely, have more powerfully molded the whole framework of European thought, history, institutions. How can one comprehend Europe who cannot in some degree from his own first-hand knowledge trace the influence of Greece and Rome in the last fifteen centuries? Consider, for example, the Holy Roman Empire, the Roman Catholic Church, and that great movement we call the Renaissance. And the Hellenic mind in particular is still a perennial spring of influence, showing no sign of exhaustion. There is therefore no sharp line separating Latin and Greek from modern languages. The problem of the teacher is the same in essence; any differences of method in good teaching are incidental and superficial. Mental discipline is a by-product, or one aspect of the matter—an important one, I grant, only not to be put in the foreground. It consists in assimilating, gaining facility in understanding, under many disguises, the great intellectual forces in past and present civilization, that are so largely embodied and transmitted in the respective languages and literatures. The opponents of classical study, as a rule, ignore wholly the literatures, and talk only of the Greek and Latin languages—of linguistic training. The few among them who recognize that all our teaching centers in literature make another mistake, equally gross. Like Herbert Spencer, they look on literature, as on all the arts, merely as part of the ornament and luxury of life, an amusement of leisure. That art began with the cave-dwellers, if not before; that the desire for beauty is infinitely higher than the desire for wealth, or even for bodily comfort; that the best of man has been expressed in Parthenon and Taj Mahal and Gothic cathedral rather than in transcontinental railroads, in symphony and painting and poem rather than in law codes and foreign commerce—such truths are beyond them. To discuss such topics with minds of that type is like trying to prove that his piano needs tuning to one

who has no ear. But a candid person who knows what history is may perhaps be brought to see that literature embodies the very essence and spirit of history. It is the special prerogative of literature that it takes up into itself in solution everything of lasting value—laws, institutions, sciences, in some faint shadow even the arts of form—all that is most dynamic in the life of its period. In thus becoming at home in the literature of one of the great races that have most formed the life of Europe and America, one is learning the essence of history and is studying history at its source. And the forces that have streamed so copiously from Greece, Rome, Germany, France, are very different. None of the four literatures can take the place of any other; whichever is left out, there is a dead loss. Especially so if either of the ancient pair is omitted, because those differ more, in their content, than the modern pair, and because they embody more of the forces whereby western Europe, underneath all differences, nevertheless is intellectually one.

If now I have given a correct analysis, there will still be a place for classical studies, and for Greek, in schools and colleges that aim at a liberal, rather than a purely technical or professional, education. How large a place Greek will retain depends in great part on us teachers, on our success in evoking in our pupils the educational results that the study should produce. That is the end to which it is most important that we adopt the right means. The prime reason for existence of such an association as is here proposed is that it may assist us in finding better means. If it does not lead us to teach better, in both school and college, it should quietly “cease upon the midnight with no pain.” My only motive for coming to this conference is the hope of giving and receiving such help.

Our first step must be to accept, without wasting time in complaint, the conditions we can not change. Greek is no longer, and will never be in our time, in any degree worth considering, required. Also, no commercial or other purely worldly motive will bring a single pupil our way. Mathematics, natural sciences, modern languages, formal history, economics, all have commercial applications, may help directly in careers pecuniarily attractive; not so with Greek. Even teaching Greek can never pay; anyone who can teach Greek successfully can earn far more in other ways. Also, Greek is the most diffi-

cult of the four languages we were considering. Bad teaching has made it more difficult than need be, but nothing can make it easy. Much hard work is necessary before one can gain power to read even Homer easily. All these are deterrent conditions beyond our control. How can we stem with best hope of success an adverse current so strong? The platform I propose contains nothing startling, or even new. I shall confine it to general principles, because these are the necessary bases of rational method, and practical details must vary with circumstances.

1. Our goal must be steadily kept in view. The purpose of studying Greek is to gain a *first-hand* acquaintance with a great force in civilization—a force that has been peculiarly effective in the higher ranges of the world's thought, literature, and art.

A fair degree of first-hand knowledge of Hellenism enlarges greatly one's intellectual comprehension of the past, enables one to see many present problems in juster perspective, and has extraordinary power to mold and refine the taste. The best evidence of this is the fact that so many who studied Greek unwillingly, and were wretchedly taught, yet come to realize in after-years the inestimable value of even their imperfect contact with the Hellenic spirit. This is some of the evidence that Mr. Adams ignored.

2. Our immediate goal, to be kept ever before us in daily work, is to make closer, richer, more living, this fructifying contact of our individual students with the Hellenic spirit.

Only thus can they be permanently won to our side. The inner experience of our students, especially their sense of it in riper years, must be our chief argument—an argument to be advanced by them, not by us. It is the only argument that is unanswerable. All significant relations between Hellas and the modern world must be clearly brought out, so far as our pupils can even partially grasp them, as they present themselves in the text before us; the content, the heart, of the page before us must be brought home to the pupil's mind. Take three illustrations only. Within the first week take fifteen minutes to show how our alphabet—significant name—came from an early Greek form, modified by Roman use, enlarged by modern differentiation and addition; at the same time let them see, on a chart of the Russian alphabet, that it too is of Greek origin,

modified from a Byzantine form. Some at least will thus early grasp the significance of the fact that all European writing is derived from Hellas. Secondly, in the *Anabasis* point out the significance of the fact that to a miscellaneous crowd of Greek mercenaries government by persuasion, rule of the majority, universal suffrage and equality of votes, were as much a matter of course as they are to us. Let the pupils see that these fundamental principles of our government are not in their origin American, nor English, but Greek. Again, in reading tragedy show how the principles of dramatic construction were not only understood, but were discovered, by the Athenians. This is the natural induction into the grammar of dramatic art. I do not find that my students bring to me much knowledge of this sort from their reading of Shakespere with their teachers of English.

3. Since results in our pupils are of such vital importance, and since Greek is no longer obligatory on anyone, aim at quality before numbers.

That means higher standards of attainment. Let us try to take with us all who can come—no others. No more “limp superficiality.” The serious difficulties of Greek as compared with German or Latin are three: a large vocabulary less represented in familiar English, a bewildering mass of verb-forms, and the syntax of the verb. The last, however, is the least. If taken up in the modern way, the phenomena classified and named by the mode of the clause and by the introductory conjunction, the difficulties soon vanish, provided the pupil has not been first confused by the old classification, and provided the verb-forms are well learned. Insist therefore on the mastery of the inflections. These cannot be fully learned in the first year; much repetition is needful while reading the *Anabasis*. But by the end of the second year the regular inflections and all the frequently recurring irregular ones should be so learned that future progress may be rapid. Improve tools to the utmost; we can’t afford waste of youthful efforts, or of our own. Win, lead, persuade, drive; when all fails, eliminate. Kindness, sympathetic help, gentleness of manner so far as possible; but firmness, for the good of all.

4. Admit no dividing line, in essential aims and principles of teaching, between ancient languages and modern.

In neither can ability to speak be the first aim in our classes;

in both alike the training of ear and tongue is fundamentally necessary. Insist on both from the beginning in Greek, as you would in French, and for the same reason, because so most rapidly will the pupil acquire a feeling for the language, begin to recognize that this too is a natural way of saying things. This might be a text for a treatise. I can only remind you now that it is easier to remember five related facts than one isolated one; that the memory of ear and tongue reinforces the memory of eye and hand; that Greek, like every other language, is primarily a series of spoken sounds. The teacher who thinks there isn't time to have his pupils read much aloud and translate from hearing is wasting time, neglecting the greater for the less, and delaying progress. All this is still more important for Latin because Latin is begun earlier, is commonly the child's first foreign language, and habits acquired in the first year of Latin are hard to change. Our brethren on the modern-language side have some ground for their complaint that pupils attack French and German wrongly because Latin teachers start them wrongly. By the beginning of freshman year the damage of such a wrong start is nearly irreparable.

Two principles, axiomatic in teaching living languages, may be put as corollaries here.

a) Sound psychology demands a minimum of formal grammar, *well learned*, closest contact with the original, and as much reading as can be done with understanding.

b) Philology as a science, in the narrower sense, has nothing to do directly with teaching a language and literature for culture. It has no place in school or college; it belongs in the graduate school alone.

5. Finally, we must enlarge ourselves and keep sane, because the teacher's personality is always the largest factor in his influence.

The man or woman must not be lost in the teacher; we must have interests beyond the school or college; our influence in the school or college will be the greater. In particular we must show in ourselves the proper effects of classical study, in developing breadth and perspective. No one is fit to teach beginners who has not read widely. If you are teaching Xenophon and have not read through the *Anabasis*, *Cyropaedeia*, and *Memorabilia*, read them at once; if you have not

read the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* through, read them next. And so on. Read regularly something that you are not teaching, and may never teach, until you have covered a wide range, and until such reading is easy. Not only that; we must read the best in every literature accessible to us. We must saturate ourselves in the best music and the best art of every kind within our reach. Thukydides' boast of his Athenians must be true of us: φιλοκαλοῦμεν μετ' εὐτελείας καὶ φιλοσοφοῦμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας. The εὐτέλεια is prescribed for us. But the love of beauty and of clear thinking can be cherished without wealth and without weakness. In an age of extravagance and overvaluation of luxury we must show that we can live as people of culture, and at the same time of practical efficiency in daily life, on relatively small incomes. Success in this will elevate and add power to our professional work.

It is really a high distinction that our subject appeals only to the highest motives, the highest ideals. It will continue to attract the strongest and most aspiring minds, the intellectual leaders of their generation. Dealing with such minds, and molding them through such studies, we may class ourselves, not among the artisans, but among the artists, though in the humbler ranks. And we must accept with sincerity the words of Lanier:

The artist's market is the heart of man;
The artist's price, some little good of man.